



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and Latin literature were lived and loved, this minute scholarship for the young was as yet happily undreamed of. Knowledge of hidden quantity never yet made a boy or girl a lover of classic literature. We are lamenting the decline of cultural education. Love of culture is the only foundation on which to build it. But to the non-comprehending child the refinements of letter-by-letter instruction are refinements of cruelty, and are anything but love-compelling.

Again, while I do not believe in continuous prose for beginners, I certainly do not believe, on the other hand, in sentences of infantile simplicity. That is merely rewriting the exercises of the first year book. Sentences illustrating specific principles we must have for the Caesar work; but let us use good long ones that mean something, and that not always on the surface. With Cicero should come continuous prose, and that only. The exercises, while not imitating text, should deal with the same general subjects of discourse—military narrative at first, then argument, politics, legal subjects, invective. The vocabulary should rigidly conform to the usage of Caesar and Cicero in the portions read. For the narrative prose it should be limited to about 600 words, and for the whole course to not over 1000. This is a severe task. For the pupil to recognize 1000 Latin words when he sees them is a far easier problem than to be able to use 1000 as media of expression. The pupil should be taught to pursue an elusive Latin word by recalling as many as possible of the synonyms of the English word. Some one of these will almost certainly suggest the Latin. Thus a limited Latin vocabulary will suffice for a fairly wide range of English expression.

The following seems a profitable method of treating the vocabulary of the second year. Most first year books contain working vocabularies of from 725 to 775 words. Practically all the 600 words of second year prose should be of this number, so that in mastering them the pupil is simply renewing old acquaintance. No word should be employed in an exercise which has not occurred in the text of Caesar previously read. Caesar's vocabulary lends itself admirably to such arrangement. 363 words occur twenty times or over in the Gallic War (only eleven of these are not found in Book I). 316 others occur ten times and under twenty (only forty-eight of these are not in Book I). A very few words occurring less than ten times are necessary for sentence connection. Thus the first book of Caesar, the one most familiar, may be made to provide almost the entire vocabulary for exercises in narrative prose. Needless to say, no grammatical construction foreign to Caesar or Cicero should be employed. It may be objected that the formal presentation and study of the exact information advocated above would leave too little time for actual exercise work. One exercise accurately

written is worth pages of random shots. The principles are fundamental; when these and suitable vocabulary are mastered, original exercises may be written in endless variety by the students themselves: how much more by any teacher who has sufficient interest, enthusiasm and energy. And a teacher who has not somewhere in his mental make-up an enthusiasm for Latin writing had better let the subject alone.

If I am asked whether a secondary school pupil should acquire a Latin style as the result of his training, whether, at the end of his year in Caesar, his Latin should bear the image and superscription of Caesar, and whether, at the end of his course, the bombastic toga of the savior of his country should have settled fitly on his shoulders, I reply that I am not concerned. This idea of style and imitation has upset English instruction already: shall we let it confuse the Latin as well? Instead of bringing home to the pupil the fundamentals of grammar and analysis, much English instruction, in all but the best schools, now consists—under the euphemistic title of 'language'—in badly rewriting good models. 'Write in the style of Caesar', 'write in the style of Cicero', say some of our college examiners. As well say to a boy in the English composition class, 'Write a brief story in the diction and style of Rudyard Kipling'. Oh, if that could be taught! The finished product sells for twenty-five cents a word. All I ask of my boys when they go from me is the power to turn simple English into correct Latin, with attention to the basic principles of word order and sentence structure. We are not trying to make little Caesars and Ciceros: we are trying to develop the powers of youthful minds. Style is an inimitable, individual gift.

In the manual training schools the boys build from plain patterns neat work boxes and mission chairs with the same tools with which the skilled cabinet maker fashions exquisitely shaped and carved furniture, accurate in every joining. To set novices to imitate these would be folly. Our Latin prose pupils are using the implements of Caesar and Cicero wherewith they built their temples of Mars and of the Muses, eternal, spacious and ornate. Why then should we expect from our novices more than a tiny hut of refuge from the whirlwinds of ignorance?

B. W. MITCHELL.

CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL, PHILADELPHIA.

REVIEWS

Caesar's Conquest of Gaul. By T. Rice Holmes. Second edition revised throughout and largely rewritten. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press (1911). Pp. lx + 872. \$7.75.

This important work appeared in its first edition in 1899 from the press of The Macmillan Company; its value to students of Caesar and the soundness

of its views were immediately recognized. In January, 1909, the edition was exhausted and The Macmillan Company reprinted Part I in a separate volume containing the narrative of the Gallic War, omitting Part II, which included the valuable excursuses and commentaries and comprised the greater part of the original volume and was therefore the portion of the work most needed by the serious student of Caesar. Scholars everywhere will now welcome the publication by The Clarendon Press of a second edition of the complete work, which incorporates also the results of the critical and the exegetical study of the Gallic War during the last twelve years. The present writer reviewed the first edition at some length in *The Classical Journal*, 1 (1906), 133-137; he deems it unnecessary, therefore, to give here an extended review of the second edition, but the book is so important a contribution to Caesarian literature that it deserves more than passing notice.

Although Mr. Holmes adheres in the main to the views expressed in the former edition, the book has been carefully revised page by page: trivial and unnecessary parts have been omitted, and the discussion of some subjects has been in part rewritten; other parts are entirely new. A great deal has been written on the Gallic War in the last decade, much of it no doubt inspired by Mr. Holmes' interpretations, and he has made full use of this new material. Important recent publications are Meusel's article, Caesar, *Beiträge zur Kritik des Bellum Gallicum*, in the *Jahresberichte des Philologischen Vereins zu Berlin*, 1910, pp. 20-75, Jullian's work on the *Histoire de la Gaule*, still in course of publication, and Klotz, *Cäsarstudien*, 1910. Mr. Holmes concludes the Preface of his book with this statement:

The book in its present form may be regarded as final; for the edition is large, and I do not expect that another will be demanded while I live, or that I should have time or inclination to make further alterations. Moreover, although minor details are constantly being added to our knowledge of prehistoric Gaul, and although the criticism of Caesar's text has been continued with zeal and not wholly without profit, it is unlikely that we shall ever know much more about Caesar's conquest, with which this book is mainly concerned, than we do now. The present book covers 872 pages compared with 846 pages of the first edition. Part I, the narrative including the Introduction, has been increased by 37 pages.

In the account of the battle between Caesar and the Helvetians Mr. Holmes adopts the theory of Bircher (*Bibracte*, pp. 22-28), that after the first encounter the Helvetians retreated toward the southwest across the stream Auzon and that we are to find the *mons* which Caesar mentions (*B. G.* 1.25) here, not in the mountain near Montmort (according to Stoffel's identification). This new view is sup-

posed to offer an easier explanation of the phrase *latere aperto* (Chapter 25). The present reviewer supported Colonel Stoffel's theory in *Classical Philology*, 4 (1909), pp. 200-201, and is still unable to believe that the Helvetians, having first retreated across the Auzon in a southwesterly direction, should then in their later flight have deliberately turned toward the north, where we find them at the end of the campaign; they would hardly have fled northward after a battle in which they faced notheast. Furthermore, the broad level stretch from the first position above Armecy to Montmort (which the reviewer traversed and examined in the summer of 1908), would naturally suggest to the retreating enemy a flight in that direction.

The discussion of the site of the battle with Ariovistus, which can really be settled only by excavation, Mr. Holmes has amplified by dwelling on Jullian's revival of Von Kampen's theory that the battle site was about a mile and a half southwest of Cernay. On pages 218-224 Mr. Holmes reviews his discussions with the historian, G. Ferrero (for the most part already published in *The Classical Quarterly*), concerning phases of Gallic politics which may be supposed to furnish the true explanation of the Helvetian emigration. Ferrero contended that the real object of the Helvetians in their emigration was to drive out Ariovistus and that Caesar made an alliance with Ariovistus in order to secure his aid against the Helvetians. Mr. Holmes, who has confidence in Caesar's credibility and justly believes that only a critic who has had military training and experience can appreciate the military sections of Caesar's narrative, accepts the explanation of the Helvetian movement which Caesar himself gives; he believes that "Caesar regarded the presence of both the Helvetii and of Ariovistus as dangerous to Roman interests", and conjectures that the explanation of the alliance with Ariovistus was to secure the German king's neutrality in view of the threatened invasion. Mr. Holmes intimates that Ferrero possesses a speculative imagination that does not lead to historical truth.

The section on the military antiquities (559-612) is most interesting. Mr. Holmes still holds to the view that the *primorum ordinum centuriones* were the centurions of the first cohort of the legion, a view which has since been confirmed by von Domaszewski in the *Bonner Jahrbücher*, 117 (1908), 90-95.

Following Lehmann's recent study in *Klio*, 6 (1906), 237-248, Mr. Holmes gives some attention to the claims of Chaudardes as the site of the battle with the Belgae (*B. G.* 2.8-10) and has drawn the region about this site on the map opposite page 71. This place is only a little below the generally accepted site of Berry-au-Bac. Mr. Holmes finds dif-

ficulty in fitting Caesar's description of the location, particularly the phrase, *lateris deiectus* (Chapter 8), to the actual results of Stoffel's excavations. But there seems no difficulty in placing the *locus pro castris* on the west of the camp. The front of the camp would then be toward the west; Stoffel's excavations show two gates on the west side and one only on each of the other sides. By *ex utraque parte lateris* are meant the northern and southern slopes of the long east and west elevation. These slopes are not steep (*deiectus*) at the present time, but they may have been steeper in Caesar's day and may have been worn down by the century-long cultivation of the land. The phrase in *frontem leniter fastigatus paulatim ad planitiem redibat* refers to the slope toward the west and the description is equally applicable to-day. The ground plan of the *castellum* at the end of the northern trench is indeed difficult to understand; but must we suppose that all Roman *castella* were alike? May not Caesar's purpose at the time have been served by the construction of a *castellum* of an extraordinary type? Mr. Holmes concludes by asserting that the advocates of Chaudardes should excavate in their turn.

On the much discussed question of the construction of the bridge over the Rhine all the recent literature is reviewed. Mr. Holmes is inclined to accept Mr. Stanley Hall's explanation of the *fibulae*, that they were long ties connecting the lower end of the up-stream pier with the upper end of the down-stream pier.

Thus question after question of vital and practical interest to the student and teacher of Caesar are discussed, in Mr. Holmes's virile and attractive style. It is fortunate that such a clear and scholarly presentation is accessible in English. Every High School teacher of Caesar will do well to read and study the book from beginning to end.

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE.

WALTER DENNISON.

Introduction a l'Etude Comparative des Langues Indo-Européennes. Par A. Meillet. Troisième Edition. Paris: Hachette et Cie. (1912). Pp. xxvi + 502.

A popular treatise which sticks close to proven fact and sound logic and passes over in silence some of the most striking phases of the subject because there is no certainty to be had in regard to them, but every page of which is as interesting as it is clean-cut and sound—such is Meillet's book in this edition as in the former two. The theories as to the home of the original speakers of Indo-European are barely mentioned, and their culture is not once referred to. Even within the domain of linguistics the author limits himself closely to facts that can be directly inferred from the comparison of recorded forms. There is no attempt to explain phenomena that belong to the Indo-European par-

ent speech—even the obvious connection between vowel gradation and accent is ignored. But as an introduction to the comparative study of the historic Indo-European languages the book is without a serious rival.

The revision, while thorough, is confined to matters of detail. There are changes on almost every page, but in general they are less important than those which distinguished the second edition (1908) from the first (1903). The increase of 38 pages over the second edition is due in part to a more open typography, but chiefly to numerous small additions of an example, a limiting phrase, or an explanatory sentence. Here and there the progress of the science has made a more important change necessary. The chapter on method (pp. 1-33) has been more extensively revised than any other. The brief account of the Greek dialects (pp. 43-45) has been rewritten. The bibliography now fills 20 instead of 15 pages.

For the first time Tokharian, the Indo-European language recently discovered in central Asia, receives treatment in a handbook. Meillet does not expect any startling results from the study of this idiom, and he feels that we do not yet know enough about it to assign it a definite place in the Indo-European group. It is not, however, an Indo-Iranian dialect, as one might infer from its geographical position.

The mechanical execution of the book is as excellent as the publisher's name leads one to expect. Misprints are few and unimportant.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

E. H. STURTEVANT.

THE NEW YORK LATIN CLUB SCHOLARSHIP

Each year The New York Latin Club offers a Latin scholarship, for which the graduates of the New York City High Schools are eligible as candidates. It is awarded under the following conditions: the scholarship will be of the value of \$250; it shall be held for one year; it shall be awarded to that graduate, who being of good moral character, shall have obtained the highest average in the Regents' examinations in Latin, and shall have been admitted to the Freshman class of some college or technical school approved by the Carnegie Foundation.

This year there were fifteen candidates, representing seven different schools. Those receiving an average of ninety per cent or above were as follows: Benjamin Goldberg, Eastern District H. S., 93.08; Dorrice V. Davis, Erasmus Hall H. S., 94.16; Edith D. Fanning, Flushing H. S., 91.75; Mabel Cohen, 93.91; Wendell G. Fogg, 95.79; Eugenia M. Kalbacher, 91.25; Morris H. S.; Elma Klopfer, Wadleigh H. S., 91.25.

Therefore, the scholarship for 1912-13 is awarded to Wendell G. Fogg, of Morris High School.

WILLIAM F. TIBBETTS.